



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/337,538	06/22/1999	FRANK ALAN PAVELSKI	52817.000097	9120

29315 7590 02/13/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

P

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/337,538	Applicant(s) PAVELSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Mylinh T Tran	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 10/22/03 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-12, 15-19 and 22-26 have been amended. Claims 29-33 have been added. However, limitations of amended and new claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record and newly discovered prior art, therefore, claims 1-33 are rejected under the new ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1, 8, 15 and 22 are

Claims ^{1, 8, 15 and 22 are} rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage in view of Adams et al. [US. 5,734,380].

As to claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, Microsoft FrontPage discloses a system for enabling a user to create a frameset arrangement for a view comprising: a predefined frameset arrangement presentation object that presents a plurality of predefined frameset arrangements to a user through a graphical user interface (page 306, figure 16.2, Layout box contains multiple of predefined frameset arrangements in the list of templates), a predefined frameset selection object that enables a user to select one of the plurality of predefined frameset arrangements through the graphical user interface (user can select a desired frameset arrangement from the list of templates of figure 16.2), and view

presentation object that presents a view to the user having the predefined frameset arrangement selected (frameset (left side of figure 16.2) is for users to view after they select from the list (right side). The difference between Microsoft FrontPage and the claim is the plurality of predefined frameset displaying simultaneously. Adams et al. shows the feature at figure 8, column 9, lines 40-53. Window is a type of frameset and these windows are represent for user to select by clicking buttons on the title bar of each window. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Microsoft FrontPage and Adams before them at the time the invention was made to modify the frameset arrangement taught by Microsoft Frontpage to include plurality of predefined frameset display simultaneously to the users of Adams, with the motivation being to make more efficient way for the user to select the objects as taught by Adams et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

and 39 - 33

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-21 and 24-28^{and 39 - 33} are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage in view of Adams et al. and further inview of Kraus et al.[6,266,684].

As to claims 2, 9, 16, 23 and 30-31, Microsoft FrontPage does not show a frame number specification object that enables a user to specify the number of frames in the plurality of predefined frameset arrangement. Kraus et al. teaches this feature at figures 2-4, column 3, lines 55-65. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Microsoft FrontPage and Kraus et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the multiple predefined frameset arrangements taught by Microsoft FrontPage to include the number of frames in the predefined frameset arrangement with the motivation for the user to be able to customize the layout of a view of a document as taught by Kraus.

As to claims 3, 10, 17, and 24, while Microsoft FrontPage shows a multiple frameset arrangement, Kraus et al. shows the predefined frameset arrangement presentation object presents the plurality of predefined frameset arrangement having the number of frames specified by the user (figures 2-4, column 3, lines 55-65).

As to claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 25 and 26, while Microsoft FrontPage shows a multiple predefined frameset arrangement and Adams shows the plurality of predefined frameset displaying simultaneously, Kraus et al. teaches the predefined frameset arrangement presentation object simultaneously displays a icon, each icon representing a predefined frameset arrangement (column 1, lines 55-60, "The invention includes presenting on a computer display a graphical image representing the frame structure of the web page, allowing a

Art Unit: 2174

creator of the web page to target a frame by selecting a corresponding portion of the graphical display with a pointing device"). Also, applicant's attention is directed to the lines "a graphical image ("icon")" at column 6, lines 3-4. In combination of Adams and Kraus, the plurality of icons are taught here.

As to claims 6, 13, 20 and 27, while Microsoft FrontPage shows a multiple predefined frameset arrangement, Kraus et al. also teaches the frameset arrangement comprises specification of the size of each frame (figures 3-4, each frame has its own size).

As to claims 7, 14, 21 and 28, while Microsoft FrontPage shows multiple predefined frameset arrangement, Kraus et al. discloses the frameset arrangement comprises specification of the location of each frame within the view (column 5, lines 12-22).

As to claim 29, the claim is analyzed as previously discusses with respect to claims 1. Besides, in combination of Microsoft FrontPage and Kraus, the predefined frameset including a predefined number of frames are taught by Kraus (figure 3 and 4) and a predefined layout for the frame are taught by Microsoft FrontPage (page 306, figure 16.2, Layout box contains multiple layouts of predefined frameset arrangements in the list of templates).

As to claim 32, while Microsoft FrontPage and shows the predefined frameset, Adams teaches a non-web document in each window of figure 8.

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 33, in combination of Microsoft FrontPage and Adams teaching each framesets including at least one frame for inputting a web document and at least one frame for inputting a non-web document.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2174

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 872-9306, may be used for all communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174


D. LUV
PRIMARY EXAMINER